

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-46 are pending in this application. Claims 11-46 are withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 is independent. In light of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment is being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner withdrew claims 11-46 as being drawn to non-elected inventions. The Examiner further rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Matsuyama* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/007733); rejected claims 1-3 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Kiguchi* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210361); and rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuyama* in view of *Nishida* (USP 6,864,034). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102- *Matsuyama***

The Examiner rejected claim 1 asserting *Matsuyama* teaches all of the claim elements including the first film comprising at least one gap width regulating, by which a width of the gap region is narrowed citing to Fig. 11A asserting a first film is tapered and therefore includes a gap with regulating section.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, the method of manufacturing a composite film, the first film comprising at least one gap width regulating section, by which a width of the gap region is narrowed in the one direction.

In contrast, the disclosure of *Matsuyama* is directed to a method of manufacturing color filters and liquid crystal display device using the color filters. As depicted Fig. 11A, the pattern of the black matrix is formed using a black resist (BM). The partition portion tapers in as it extends from the bottom to the top of the gap. The Examiner appears to be interpreting the claim language to read on the teachings of *Matsuyama* depicted in Fig. 11A as the gap narrows from the top of the gap to the bottom of the gap.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Matsuyama* that is directed to a method of manufacturing a composite film, the first film having a plurality of partition sections extending generally along one direction, the first film comprising at least one gap with regulating section, by which a width of the gap region is narrowed in the one direction. As *Matsuyama* fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicant maintains that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by *Matsuyama*. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 – *Kiguchi et al.***

The Examiner rejected claim 1 asserting *Kiguchi et al.* discloses all of the elements as recited. However, the Examiner fails to particularly describe what portions of *Kiguchi et al.* the Examiner is relying upon in support of the rejection. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims as being anticipated by *Kiguchi et al.*, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide specific citations to *Kiguchi et al.* in support of her rejection so that Applicants may be able to properly respond.

The disclosure of *Kiguchi et al.* is directed to an electro optical apparatus, it's production method, devices, and electronic appliances. As can be seen in Figs. 3 and 4, the bottom of the gap between partition 14 is narrower then the top of the gap. As such, it appears that the Examiner is interpreting the claim language as similarly interpreted with regard to the *Matsuyama* rejection. However, as Applicants have amended the claims to recite that the first film comprises at least one gap with regulating section, by which a width of the gap region is narrowed in the one direction, Applicants maintain that *Kiguchi et al.* fails to anticipate claim 1

for similar reasons noted above with regard to *Matsuyama*. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, at least based upon their dependency on claim 1.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/779,795  
Amendment dated November 28, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2005

Docket No.: 1248-0694P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant